



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,686	09/29/2003	Benjamin N. Eldridge	P7D7C2-US	1295
27521	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
KEN BURRASTON KIRTON & MCCONKIE PO BOX 45120 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120			KARLSEN, ERNEST F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,686

Applicant(s)

ELDRIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

Ernest F. Karlsen

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 60-65 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0903</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The beginning of the specification should be amended to include complete information and current status of the listed patent applications.

Exactly what Applicants' priority date is for the subject matter of the active claims is not clear. The Examiner would appreciate clarification by Applicants. U.S. Patent No. 5,476,211 is not considered to contain basis for the claimed material.

Claims 60-65 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on September 27, 2004.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 47-52 and 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsujide et al.

With regard to claims 47, 49, 50, 51, 58 and 59, Tsujide et al show a burn-in apparatus for burning in a semiconductor wafer 1 where the semiconductor wafer 1 has a plurality of unsingulated semiconductor devices and each semiconductor device has a plurality of resilient contact structures 5 thereon and a test board 2 that includes a plurality of contact elements 4. Element 6 applies pressure between elements 1, 2 and

5 and the element labeled "heater or cooler" elevates the temperature. With regard to claim 48 the test wafer 2 is equivalent to a printed circuit board. With regard to claim 52, Tsujide et al disclose in column 1 a burn-in temperature of 125 degrees centigrade.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujide et al in view of Moriya.

Tsujide et al has that claimed except does not disclose anisotropic material having free standing resilient contact structures. Moriya shows resilient contact structures 13' in Figure 8B. When compressed they are considered attached and free standing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted the anisotropic material of Moriya for the anisotropic material of Tsujide et al because one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that so doing would enable better contact. Each of elements 13' is considered to include a contact tip.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsujide et al in view of Janum.

Tsujide et al show that claimed except for the temperature range. Janum shows burn-in at 150 to 200 degrees centigrade. (See column 3, lines 21 plus.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have adapted the temperature range of Janum to the apparatus of Tsujide et al because one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that so doing would enable faster burn-in time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ernest F. Karlsen at telephone number 571-272-1961.

Ernest F. Karlsen

December 10, 2004


ERNEST KARLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER